

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PLO STATEMENT AT ALGIERS
ARAB SUMMIT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, during the June 1988 Arab Summit in Algiers, a statement entitled "Prospects of the Palestinian-Israeli settlement" was circulated and its author was Bassam Abu Sherif, an advisor to Chairman Yasser Arafat.

This statement has been the subject of considerable comment, debate, and controversy since it was issued. Its origins, its possible implications, and its significance have also been debated.

I attach for the interest of my colleagues, the Abu Sherif statement as well as correspondence I had with the Department of State about the statement, my letter to the State Department of June 22, and the State Department's reply of July 25;

PROSPECTS OF A PALESTINIAN-ISRAELI
SETTLEMENT

(By Bassam Abu Sherif)

Everything that has been said about the Middle East conflict has focused on the difference between Palestinians and Israelis and ignored the points on which they are in almost total agreement.

These points are easy to overlook, hidden as they are under a 70-year accumulation of mutual hostility and suspicion, but they exist nevertheless and in them lies the hope that the peace that has eluded this region for so long is finally within reach.

Peel off the layers of fear and mistrust that successive Israeli leaders have piled on the substantive issues and you will find that the Palestinians and Israelis are in general agreement on ends and means.

Israel's objectives are lasting peace and security. Lasting peace and security are also the objectives of the Palestinian people. No one can understand the Jewish people's centuries of suffering more than the Palestinians. We know what it means to be stateless and the object of the fear and prejudice of the nations. Thanks to the various Israeli and other governments that have had the power to determine the course of our people's lives, we know what it feels like when human beings are considered somehow less human than others and denied the basic rights that people around the globe take for granted. We feel that no people—neither the Jewish people nor the Palestinian people—deserves the abuse and disfranchisement that homelessness inevitably entails. We believe that all peoples—the Jews and the Palestinians included—have the right to run their own affairs, expecting from their neighbors not only non-belligerence but the kind of political and economic cooperation without which no state can be truly secure, no matter how massive its war machine, and without which no nation can truly prosper, no matter how generous its friends in distant lands may be.

The Palestinians want that kind of lasting peace and security for themselves and the Israelis because no one can build his own future on the ruins of another's. We are confident that this desire and this realization are shared by all but an insignificant minority in Israel.

The means by which the Israelis want to achieve lasting peace and security is direct talks, with no attempt by any outside party to impose or veto a settlement.

The Palestinians agree. We see no way for any dispute to be settled without direct talks between the parties to that dispute, and we feel that any settlement that has to be imposed by an outside power is a settlement that is unacceptable to one or both of the belligerents and therefore a settlement that will not stand the test of time. The key to a Palestinian-Israeli settlement lies in talks between the Palestinians and the Israelis. The Palestinians would be deluding themselves if they thought that their problems with the Israelis can be solved in negotiations with non-Israelis, including the United States. By the same token, the Israelis—and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, who has been shuttling to the Middle East for discussions on his peace proposals—would be deluding themselves if they thought that Israel's problems with the Palestinians can be solved in negotiations with non-Palestinians, including Jordan.

The Palestinians would like to choose their Israeli interlocutor. We have little doubt that we could reach a satisfactory settlement with the Peace Now movement in a month. We know, however, that an agreement with Peace Now would not be an agreement with Israel, and since an agreement with Israel is what we are after, we are ready to talk to Mr. Shimon Peres' Labor Alignment, or to Yitzhak Shamir's Likud Bloc, or anyone else the Israelis choose to represent them.

The Israelis and Mr. Shultz would also prefer to deal with Palestinians of their own choosing. But it would be as futile for them as for us to talk to people who have no mandate to negotiate. If it is a settlement with the Palestinians that they seek, as we assume it is, then it is with the representatives of that people that they must negotiate, and the Palestinian people, by the only means that they have at their disposal, have chosen their representatives. Every Palestinian questioned by diplomats and newsmen of the international community has stated unequivocally that his representative is the Palestine Liberation Organization. If that is regarded as an unreliable expression of the Palestinians' free will, then give the Palestinians the chance to express their free will in a manner that will convince all doubters: arrange for an internationally-supervised referendum in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and allow the population to choose between the PLO and any other group of Palestinians that Israel or the United States or the international community wishes to nominate. The PLO is ready to abide by the outcome and step aside for any alternative leadership should the Palestinian people choose one.

The PLO will do this because its *raison d'être* is not the undoing of Israel, but the salvation of the Palestinian people and their rights, including their right to democratic self-expression and national self-determination.

Regardless of the satanic image that the PLO's struggle for those rights has given it in the United States and Israel, the fact remains that this organization was built on democratic principles and seeks democratic objectives. If Israel and its supporters in the U.S. administration can grasp that fact, the fears that prevent them from accepting the PLO as the only valid interlocutor toward any Palestinian-Israeli settlement would vanish.

Those fears, as far as I can tell from what has been written and said in Israel and the United States, center on the PLO's to unconditionally accept Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and on the possibility that a Palestinian State on the West Bank and Gaza would be a radical, totalitarian threat to its neighbor.

The PLO, however, does accept Resolutions 242 and 338. What prevents it from saying so unconditionally is not what is in the resolutions but what is not in them: neither resolution says anything about the national rights of the Palestinian people, including their democratic right to self-expression and their national right to self-determination. For that reason and that reason alone, we have repeatedly said that we accept Resolutions 242 and 338 in the context of the other UN resolutions, which do recognize the national rights of the Palestinian people.

As for the fear that a Palestinian State would be a threat to its neighbor, the democratic nature of the PLO—with its legislative, executive and other popularly-based institutions—should argue against it. If that does not constitute a solid enough guarantee that the State of Palestine would be a democratic one, the Palestinians would be open to the idea of a brief, mutually-acceptable transitional period during which an international mandate would guide the occupied Palestinian territories to democratic Palestinian statehood.

Beyond that, the Palestinians would accept—indeed, insist on—international guarantees for the security of all states in the region, including Palestine and Israel. It is precisely our desire for such guarantees that motivates our demand that bilateral peace talks with Israel be conducted in the context of a UN-sponsored international conference.

The Palestinians feel that they have much more to fear from Israel, with its mighty war machine and its nuclear arsenal, than Israel has to fear from them. They would therefore welcome any reasonable measure that would promote the security of their state and its neighbors, including the deployment of a UN buffer force on the Palestinian side of the Israeli-Palestinian border.

Time, sometimes the great healer, is often the great spoiler. Many Israelis no doubt realize this and are trying to communicate it to the rest of their people. As for us, we are

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

ready for peace now, and we can deliver it. It is our hope that the opportunity that presents itself today will not be missed.

If it is missed, we will have no choice but to continue to exercise our right to resist the occupation, our ultimate aim being a free, dignified and secure life not only for our children but also for the children of the Israelis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 22, 1988.

HON. GEORGE P. SHULTZ,
Secretary, Department of State, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: At the recent Algiers Summit, a document entitled "Prospects of a Palestinian-Israeli Settlement" by Bassam Abu Sherif was circulated. A copy of that document is attached.

I would like to have the comments of the Department of State on this document. Specifically, I would like you to address the following questions:

Is it your assessment that the document represents the views of Mr. Arafat or the PLO?

Is it authoritative to the best of your knowledge?

If authoritative, what is the significance, if any, of the document?

Do you feel this document was designed to attract international attention, as opposed to representing PLO policy at the time of the Algiers Summit?

In what ways does the document represent a change in the PLO position?

In a statement, your press spokesperson said that there were positive elements in the PLO statement. What are those positive elements and what is negative in the statement?

Is it helpful or harmful to efforts to try to restart the peace process?

What, if anything, does the administration plan to do to explore further this document and any possible ramifications it might have?

I appreciate your consideration of these questions and look forward to an early reply.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe
and the Middle East.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: The Secretary has authorized me to respond to your letter of June 22, 1988, in which you ask for our comments on "Prospects of a Palestinian-Israeli Settlement," distributed prior to the recent Algiers Summit.

The article was unsigned at the time of distribution. As you are aware, however, Bassam Abu Sharif has since declared himself to be the author. Subsequent public attacks on his article by such senior PLO officials as Salah Khalaf reinforce our initial impression that the proposals do not represent an authoritative or agreed PLO position. As you know, Yasir Arafat has declined to support the article officially and we do not know if it reflects his personal views.

The significance of the article remains to be seen. If this is a personal effort with no subsequent steps or resonance within the PLO, then it will have little significance. We have nevertheless been struck by the overall constructive tone of the article, particularly

its emphasis on the existence of Israel and on the ultimate goal of the Palestinians as lasting peace and security for Israel and for the Palestinian people. A key substantive point is the assertion that the conflict can only be solved by direct talks. Based on the efforts to ensure publication of this article in the international press, and the fact that it was written originally in English, we conclude that its principal target audience was the West and possibly Israel and not the Arab world, although it has since been widely reprinted.

We note that the paper is silent on the subject of terrorism and that it repeats the PLO's equivocal position on acceptance of UNSC Resolutions 242 and 338. The article does not alter basic PLO positions on a PLO-led Palestinian state, or the PLO's claim to be the sole representative of the Palestinian people. It does, however, offer to put this latter point to the test of a referendum.

The practice of the PLO for years has been to issue a multiplicity of mutually inconsistent and deniable statements and proclamations, which produces confusion and discredits it as a serious entity. Should events prove this article to be the exception, and to mark the beginning of a responsible, reliable, authoritative and realistic approach by the PLO to the peace process, then it would be welcomed. Regrettably, the public indications so far do not bear this out.

Sincerely,

RICHARD W. MURPHY.

TRIBUTE TO ANNE HERROD

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

MR. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to share with my colleagues a tribute to an outstanding citizen in my district, Mrs. Anne Herrod.

Mrs. Herrod recently received the distinction of being named the city of Richmond's June Citizen of the Month, after having been nominated for this honor by Volunteers of America, Temple Beth Hillel, and Friends of Meals on Wheels. For her outstanding volunteer work, Mrs. Herrod was recognized by the Richmond City Council at the June 6 city council meeting. I would like to take this time to add my own recognition of her inspiring activities.

Mrs. Herrod's volunteer activity is well known by the public agencies of Richmond and West County, but I would like to spread her story further. A proud Richmond resident for almost 40 years, Mrs. Herrod has dedicated much of that time to improving the lives of the less fortunate. She is a regular volunteer at the Souper Kitchen, where she attends to the needs of the homeless and poor by preparing and serving meals to those unable to afford them. Mrs. Herrod is also actively involved with Temple Beth Hillel, where she heads the congregation's sunshine committee, visiting and providing help—such as door-to-door car service—for those in need. For over 14 years she has also been a volunteer driver for Meals on Wheels, a program in which drivers deliver home-cooked meals to the elderly and the housebound.

Luckily for the city of Richmond, Anne Herrod's philosophy, "Life is a lot richer when you do things with and for other people," has proven contagious. One of her greatest contributions to volunteer activity is her continual recruitment of new volunteers through her dedication and enthusiasm. In this era in which parochial concerns and selfishness are all too prevalent, Anne Herrod and her actions stand as an inspiration to us all. Along with the city of Richmond, her husband Sam, and her daughter and grandchildren, I am proud of Anne Herrod.

SUPPORT THE JOINT RESOLUTION DESIGNATING DECEMBER 15, 1988, AS "NATIONAL ARAB-AMERICAN DAY"

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

MR. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to designate December 15, 1988 as "National Arab-American Day." The Arab immigrants first started to arrive to the United States in 1875. From that time on, they strove diligently to contribute to the cultural and economic growth of this great country. Yet, many of us today do not recognize the Arab people for all that they truly are.

The term "Arab" does not represent a religion, because its composure contains many religions. It is not a nationality, but made up of many nations whose identity is everchanging. The Arab culture is rich in history and tradition. It is a culture which exists despite geographic, political, and religious barriers.

Despite this, there seems to be a stigma today that goes along with being an Arab-American. There is an unfair stereotype that these citizens must live with regardless of their endless contributions to society. Congress should take positive action to dispel negative stereotypes about Arab-Americans that may persist. That is why I feel I must introduce this most necessary legislation.

The Arab-Americans have worked hard through the years and were willing to alter many of their customs in order to be viable citizens. They were so intent on becoming good Americans, they put aside their Eastern roots. It is time to remember those roots. America is a nation of many cultures. We must never forget what cultural ingredients are mixed in our great melting pot. We must never forget the Arab-Americans who strove, and still strive today, for our Nation's prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

THE ROLE OF THE CONSTABLE

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

MR. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a friend and constituent, Mr. Hal Lef-

court of Levittown, PA, I rise to inform my colleagues of the history and continued significance of constables in law enforcement and the administration of justice in the United States.

In fact, in the early colonial days of our great country, the constable was the only law enforcement person implementing the existing common laws which were the law of the land.

The constable performed these duties on a volunteer basis on behalf of the taxpayers who elected them.

The evolution of the salaried modern-day police department and related law enforcement agencies in an expanding delivery of justice system comes from their heritage—the constable.

A former constable, Milton Coggins of Newnan, GA, supported by the National Constables Association [NCA], has proposed a system of Federal and/or State grants available to the judiciary, the county commissioners and local municipalities who employ the services of the cost-effective, "human resource" of constables. A constable is equipped, by law, to carry out the noncrime prevention duties under the direction of the chief of a police department, to service the process of the minor courts and to perform a myriad of duties for the county commissioners and local municipalities.

Today, the National Constables Association, the voice of the working and professionally trained constable, is giving a dramatic rebirth of the constable system, at tremendous savings to the Nation's taxpayers.

More and more local municipalities are finding it increasingly difficult to pay for the salary and benefits of new patrolmen. Constables are legally self-employed contractors who provide their own liability insurance, health insurance, the use of their own emergency vehicle and their own uniform and radio communication equipment.

Most constables carry statuted police powers of arrest and are trained to carry defensive weapons. There are constables who service only the minor courts and there are constables who only service the executive branch of government, the county commissioners and the local municipalities.

In all cases, the constable can be paid for services on a salaried basis, an hourly basis or on a fee plus mileage basis at almost no cost to the taxpayers.

May I urge my colleagues to give their active support to the valid efforts of the National Constables Association, State-to-State, as they continue their nationwide program to regain and update the historical role of the position of the constable in the delivery of justice system as promulgated by the judicial and executive branches of our Government.

RONALD GOLDFARB'S TRIBUTE TO JAMES SKELLY WRIGHT

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, with the death of James Skelly Wright, America has lost a

tireless fighter for civil rights and racial justice. Judge Wright served with distinction for more than three decades on the Federal court. His rulings on desegregation were important milestones in achieving racial equality. Although subjected to threats, Judge Wright never flinched from the duties of his office.

Shortly before his death, Judge Wright was interviewed for a public television program by the distinguished Washington attorney, Ronald Goldfarb. His moving tribute to Judge Wright appeared recently in the Washington Post. I commend the article to my colleagues:

WE ARE, ALL OF US, FREE-BORN AMERICANS

It is odd that students at places like Harvard Law School wear Skelly Wright T-shirts. A shy and simple man, whose modesty belied his judicial activism and personal toughness, Wright was not a product of the social or legal elite which came to admire him so. He came from a poor Catholic New Orleans family, worked his way through Loyola University Law School at night, taught high school during the Depression, got his first job through a political connection, and was a conventional tough prosecutor until World War II, when he served in the Coast Guard in England. There he met his wife Helen (to the end he called her "Shugah").

After the war he practiced law in Washington alone and briefly with two other lawyers. His most notable case was a famous capital punishment appeal, which he lost in the U.S. Supreme Court. In 1947, he filled an opening in the U.S. attorney's office in New Orleans. Truman's surprise election a year later extended Wright's prosecutor's job. In 1949, at 38, he was appointed a federal trial judge.

There was no reason to suspect from such a background that Skelly Wright would become the extraordinary and controversial champion of the Bill of Rights, and particularly of civil rights, that he did, or to think, judging by his gentle and modest personal life style, that he would become so ardent and courageous an activist on behalf of civil rights and civil liberties. Few judges in American history will leave bigger footprints on this terrain.

The case—or series of cases over several years—that catapulted Skelly Wright into national prominence was *Bush v. Orleans Parish Schools*, involving the desegregation of New Orleans public schools in the aftermath of *Brown v. Board of Education*. It was a time when civil rights were not in fashion and blacks had few allies in government. Wright adamantly enforced *Brown*, and as a result he incurred the wrath of his community. He was ostracized viciously, hanged in effigy and made a social pariah. Earlier he had ordered the desegregation of Louisiana State University law school; indeed between 1952 and 1962—early days in the civil rights struggle in America—Wright issued 41 decisions on racial integration. In the words of Jack Bass, a journalist who studied southern judges, Skelly Wright, very much alone, "broke the back of the states' efforts at massive resistance . . . and upheld federal supremacy under the Constitution."

Wright's actions took courage at that time and in that place. A few years ago, during a television interview, I asked him to explain

what had prompted him to act so bravely and nobly. He was embarrassed by that assessment, saw himself as having done the only thing that could have been done, and felt deserving of no special credit for his judicial integrity. But he did recall an incident that moved him and still haunted him decades later as we spoke. When he was U.S. attorney in New Orleans, he told me, his office was across the street from the Home for the Blind. One Christmas Eve he was looking out his window and noticed a bus unloading a group of blind Negroes who were led by a white person to the entrance for blacks at the end of the building. "They couldn't even see," he remembered, staring into the distant past with eyes that filled as he spoke, "yet they made them walk into separate doors. That sight still effects me."

When President Kennedy took office, Wright was promoted from the U.S. District Court in New Orleans, where he had sat for 13 years, to the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, where he was to serve for 25 more years, the last of them as chief judge. It was speculated that Wright would replace his friend and fellow southerner on the Supreme Court, but presidential politics precluded such a move. Many of his corps of former law clerks went on to Supreme Court clerkships, and many of them are law professors now. A prolific flow of law review articles and speeches provided Wright with a national stage and made him far more influential than most lower court judges.

In Washington, Wright's involvement with controversial cases, particularly civil rights cases, continued. He was the author of the famous *Hobson* decision seeking to end de facto segregation in the Washington schools. He authored a stream of civil liberties-sided cases in the area of criminal justice, championed the claims of poor people for equal justice, and was a constant and articulate defender of press rights. The body of Wright writings—more than 1,000 judicial opinions and scores of law review articles—is vast and influential. But his personal example—especially in the South when it was hard and risky to act during those early days of the civil rights revolution—was his greatest achievement.

The late law professor Arthur Miller, a Wright biographer, considered Skelly Wright a result-oriented, plain-speaking judge who always viewed the Constitution not as a lawyer's document "but as a charter for the achievement of social justice." No better epitaph could be devised for Wright than his own touching words written three decades ago at the time of the integration of New Orleans' public schools. He wrote the words on the back of a Mardi Gras brochure, but they are etched now on a family heirloom. The words capture the man's elegance and humanity:

"The problem of changing a people's mores, particularly those with an emotional overlay, is not to be taken lightly. It is a problem which will require the utmost patience, understanding, generosity and forbearance from all of us of whatever race. But the magnitude of the problem may not nullify the principle. And that principle is that we are, all of us, free-born Americans with a right to make our way unfettered by sanctions imposed by man because of the work of God."

EFFECTIVENESS OF DEATH
PENALTY QUESTIONED

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, as debate in Congress over how to strengthen our Nation's war on drugs intensifies, I believe we need to examine the many alternative approaches to combating drugs open to us. An article in *The Washington Post* on July 26, 1988, does an excellent job of outlining the ramifications of these different approaches. I would like to direct my colleagues attention to the article's discussion of what the possible consequences could be of imposing a death penalty on those convicted of being drug kingpins. This is an enlightening article which I commend to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the *Washington Post*, July 26, 1988]"SELF-DEFEATING" DRUG BILLS—DEATH
PENALTY COULD BAR TRIALS OF "KINGPINS"
(By Michael Isikoff)

Among all the election-year ideas for combating the drug problem, few have proved more politically popular than the ultimate one—a federal death penalty for major narcotics traffickers.

"It is about time we say to the Darth Vaders of the drug world that you will face the ultimate sanction," proclaimed Sen. Alfonse M. D'Amato (R-N.Y.), as a measure imposing the death penalty for drug-related killings sailed through the Senate by a 65-to-29 vote last month.

But as the plan has gained momentum, winning endorsements from President Reagan and Vice President Bush, some law enforcement officials warn that it could prevent many of the biggest drug "kingpins" from even being tried, much less executed.

The reason is that most of the biggest drug traffickers, such as the leaders of the cocaine cartels, live abroad. And almost no country will agree to extradite any of its citizens to a nation where they face the prospect of the death penalty, according to federal prosecutors and State Department legal experts.

"You have to consider the practical consequences of what you're doing," said Richard Gregorie, chief assistant U.S. attorney in Miami, whose office has indicted more drug kingpins than any other U.S. attorney's office in the country. "If we imposed the death penalty, we wouldn't be able to get any of the true drug lords. It would be self-defeating."

As a questionable weapon in the war on drugs, the death penalty proposal does not stand alone, according to many experts. As Congress races to enact major drug legislation in time for this fall's election campaign, scores of sweeping proposals have been advanced. They include: bringing in the military to help interdict drugs at the border; imposing harsher sanctions on illegal drug users; instituting widespread drug testing in the workplace, and spending billions in new funds for anti-drug programs aimed at treating and deterring drug abusers.

But many experts and law enforcement officials question whether such measures can make a serious dent in the nation's narcotics trade. And in almost every case, they say, the most politically popular ideas will have the least impact on the most serious and alarming aspects of the drug problem,

for example, the rise of "crack" use among inner-city youths or the spreading activities of urban gangs trafficking in drugs.

"What we really may be getting here is a pig in a poke," said Peter Reuter, an economist for the Rand Corp. who specializes in federal drug policy. "We don't have the slightest idea what the consequences of some of these proposals are going to be. Yet we're on the verge of putting into place some far-reaching changes in the law that may have very little to do with the problems they are designed to solve."

The most graphic example cited by many law enforcement professionals has been the attempt to enlist the military in interdiction, an effort embodied by a House-passed amendment to a defense authorization bill in May directing the Pentagon to "substantially" reduce drug smuggling within 45 days. Since then, a House-Senate conference committee on the defense bill has narrowed the scope of the military's role considerably, although the Pentagon still would be given primary responsibility for surveillance and intelligence.

In recent interviews, officials of the Drug Enforcement Administration and the U.S. Customs Service contended that the movement to bring in the military illustrates a lack of understanding among lawmakers about how drug smugglers operate.

According to these officials, the biggest cocaine shipments enter the country on ships, hidden inside routine commercial cargo such as roses or concentrated orange juice.

The Customs Service is physically able to inspect no more than 3 percent of the million cargo containers that enter the country every year, according to agency figures. Finding the right containers among the hundreds typically aboard each ship is a painstaking task and largely immune to detection by Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) planes or other intelligence assets at the Pentagon's disposal, they say.

"I don't know of anything the military can do to help us in this area," said Patrick O'Brien, special agent in charge of the U.S. Customs Service in Miami. "We've given a lot of thought to the container problem and the only way to stop it is getting on the forklifts and start opening up all the boxes . . . What good does another AWACS plane do? . . . What you need is information on specific cargoes on specific ships."

In recent weeks, attention in Congress has shifted from stopping the supply of drugs from abroad to curbing demand at home. With 205 bills and resolutions on the drug issue introduced this session, congressional leaders have created special "task forces" charged with piecing together disparate elements into an omnibus bill. Operating under an unusual "fast track" procedure that bypasses most public hearings and subcommittee deliberations, House Speaker Jim Wright (D-Tex.) and Senate Majority Leader Robert C. Byrd (D-W.Va.) have pledged to have a mammoth package on the floor of each chamber by next month.

In the process, a seemingly endless array of novel and catchy ideas has tumbled forth. A recently unveiled Senate Democratic plan, put together by a task force headed by Daniel Patrick Moynihan (N.Y.) and Sam Nunn (Ga.), would more than double anti-drug spending to more than \$6 billion a year, create a national drug "czar" and institute new penalties for drug offenders, such as denying them federally backed mortgages and disqualifying drug-abusing lawyers and

accountants from practicing before federal courts or agencies.

Meanwhile, a Senate Republican package put together by a task force headed by Phil Gramm (Tex.) has emphasized the Reagan administration's "zero tolerance" and "user accountability" themes. Among its features: mandatory drug testing for members of Congress and their aides, forcing states to randomly test recipients of drivers' licenses for drug use, creating an "Airport Drug Interdiction Zone" in which commercial aircraft could be seized without probable cause, and denying most federal benefits, including access to public housing and job training programs, to persons convicted of drug offenses.

"What the Republicans are saying is, 'you [the drug user] are responsible for your own actions and the best thing society can do for you is make sure you have real disincentives' " to stop using drugs, said Jeffrey Eisenach, a visiting fellow at the Heritage Foundation, who helped draft the Republican plan.

The Republican plan, while it has received little public attention so far, has stirred the most opposition to date among drug professionals, in part on civil liberties grounds. "This is the kind of bill that would make Mussolini blush," said Ethan Nadelmann, a Princeton professor who has become the leading academic champion of drug legalization.

But many specialists in the drug field also point out that these and other proposed user sanctions are the least likely to deter those segments of society most afflicted by the drug problem, particularly inner-city youths who have turned increasingly to crack.

"For these kind of people, the kind of punitive sanctions they are talking about don't mean anything—long-term risks are not even in their consciousness," argues Doug Lipton, director of research and the Narcotic and Drug Research Inc., a leading New York-based clearinghouse on drug use.

"The 'zero tolerance' approach may be fine if you want to deter middle-class yacht owners from keeping a stash of marijuana on their boats," he said. "But what are these kids going to lose—their welfare hotels?"

Experts also warn that many of the legislative proposals can backfire. Denying job training to convicted drug users may cut off one of the few avenues they have toward rehabilitation. Massive drug testing may have the paradoxical effect of prodding workers to shift from marijuana, which stays in the urine from one week to a month, to cocaine or crack, which leaves the urine after two or three days, or to alcohol, which is not subject to urine testing.

"People are most likely to shift their drug use to make sure that if you take it on a Friday night, you won't test positive on Monday morning," Nadelmann said.

Senate Democrats contend that their approach—redirecting the bulk of spending toward treatment, rehabilitation and education—is more humane, and ultimately more productive, than the Republican plan emphasizing sanctions. Among the Democratic bill's provisions, for example, is \$1.2 billion in new block grant funding for drug treatment programs, a step aimed at reducing waiting periods of more than 20 weeks in some cities for admission to treatment clinics.

"What we're trying to do is help people and not punish them," said one Democratic

staffer. "The idea is to begin to meet the goal of drug treatment on request."

But many drug experts say the treatment-oriented approach also runs into problems: There is little available information on which cocaine treatment programs work and, according to Lipton, "there is no data with respect to crack" treatment. For every 100 persons who enter the door of an inner-city cocaine treatment clinic, 80 or more are likely to leave before the program is complete.

"The Republicans have a nasty point on this," said Reuter, the Rand economist. "The fact is treatment techniques for cocaine are not very good . . . and it's fair to say that if you spend large sums of money on cocaine treatment right now, you won't have much to show for it in terms of reduction of cocaine users. But you might have something to show for it in five years, it's the kind of time frame."

That, however, is precisely the point raised by many specialists in the drug field—there are no easy "quick-fix" solutions to a problem that grows and contracts in response to broad social trends.

"There's nothing in our history that suggests this can be solved in a short period of time, that you can get a rapid turnaround," said David Musto, a Yale University medical historian who has written extensively on the history of drug control. "My concern is as we turn against drugs, and come to hate the drug users, there's almost no countervailing force out, there's almost no limit to what you can do . . . and you can create a lot of havoc in people's lives."

TRIBUTE TO PAT LAUMAN OF EVART, MI

HON. BILL SCHUETTE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to take the opportunity to congratulate one of my constituents for being inducted into the Michigan Farmer's Hall of Fame. Mr. Ralph "Pat" Lauman of Evart, MI, will be inducted into the Hall of Fame on September 2 of this year.

Established in 1982, the Michigan Farmer's Hall of Fame honors farmers for their contributions to their community and to Michigan's agriculture industry. Being inducted into the Hall of Fame is a high honor and Pat has evidently demonstrated his talents and commitment to be worthy of acclamation.

Today, at the age of 92, Pat is still an active dairy farmer. He has been cultivating his 200-acre farm for over 80 years. Pat was born in 1896 on a farm in Northern Osceola County, MI. After being a farmer and carpenter during the Depression, Pat began his own small milk bottling business. His business quickly grew into a 500-quart-a-day route to the stores and homes in Evart, MI. He sold his business in 1946, but kept the dairy cattle for dairy farming. Today, his only son is a partner with him in the dairy farming business.

In 1927, he married Vera Lauman and shared 59 years with her working side by side to develop their dairy business. She helped operate the business during the good times and the bad times. Pat attributes much of his

success to his wife and son, and the hard work they put into their dairy business.

Pat is an inspiration to his community. His dedication to farming encourages others to become farmers and to appreciate agriculture. He helps the young and the old to love farming and to enjoy life. Pat still goes to the barn each day, feeds and milks the cows, and cleans the equipment.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you and our colleagues will join me in commending and congratulating Pat Lauman upon his induction into the Michigan Farmer's Hall of Fame. As our State's second largest industry, agriculture plays a significant role in the economy and social structure of our communities, and this recognition is a most prestigious honor and one that Pat and his family should always be proud to hold.

CONGRESS, AS WELL AS COURTS, MUST MAKE CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

HON. BRUCE A. MORRISON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues will be interested in seeing an article by Paul Gewirtz, professor of constitutional law at Yale Law School, commending Congress for its wisdom in passing the independent counsel statute. The article provides a very cogent analysis of the virtues of the statute, which the Supreme Court recently upheld. The article appeared in the Hartford Courant on July 24, 1988.

CONGRESS, AS WELL AS COURTS, MUST MAKE CONSTITUTIONAL LAW (By Paul Gewirtz)

Many have praised the U.S. Supreme Court's decision last month upholding the special prosecutor law, but the real credit belongs more to Congress than to the court itself.

The law was upheld because Congress did something that legislatures often fail to do. Rather than pass the buck to the courts, Congress carefully considered possible constitutional objections at the time it adopted the legislation. It wrote a balanced statute that took account of reasonable constitutional concerns and tried to minimize them.

In the end, the Supreme Court deferred to that effort. Its action illustrates the role legislatures can play in constitutional decision-making.

Congress' overriding concern, of course, was to address a sharply felt practical need—to create an independent prosecutorial office that avoided the conflict of interest of having executive-branch prosecutors investigate crimes possibly committed by top executive-branch officials.

But from the beginning, Congress heard arguments that principles of the separation of powers would be offended by having prosecutors appointed by the courts or by Congress, and then not removable by the president or attorney general. Such an approach, it was argued, would undermine legitimate executive-branch prerogatives and give inappropriate powers to other branches of government.

Aware of these issues, Congress held hearings that assessed the views of a broad

range of constitutional law experts. The drafters of the legislation sought to address many of the constitutional concerns raised—when the law was passed and through subsequent refinements.

The statute does not create special prosecutors who are altogether independent. It preserves a role for the president and attorney general in both the appointment and possible removal of special prosecutors. In addition, it avoids an excessive role for the other branches of government.

The independent counsel is appointed by a court, but only if the attorney general first determines that there are "reasonable grounds to believe that further investigation is warranted."

A special panel of judges appoints the independent counsel, but the prosecutor's jurisdiction is based on the attorney general's initial investigation. The appointing judges are disqualified from sitting in any of the cases that the independent counsel actually brings—thereby protecting the integrity of the judicial branch.

The independent counsel retains a great measure of independence, but the executive branch retains some countercheck by having the power to fire the counsel for "good cause." A further counterbalancing check is built in, however, by providing for judicial review of any decision to fire.

Congress strictly limited its own role in appointing or removing independent counsels.

Taken together, these provisions give the special prosecutor the independence necessary to be a check on executive branch lawlessness. But they also establish a broader interactive structure of checks and balances that promotes a measure of accountability and respects the prerogatives of each branch.

Critics of the law invoke "separation of powers." But our system of separation of powers was designed to preserve checks and balances in the political system. The structure of intersecting roles provided in the independent counsel legislation suggests that Congress was seeking to foster a system of checks and balances rather than subvert it.

That, at least, was what the Supreme Court concluded. Its opinion makes clear that the legislation was upheld precisely because it provided for interactive relationships among the branches and showed no sign of being a congressional power grab.

Had Congress not been so careful and balanced in attempting to avoid constitutional difficulties, the legislation might well have been struck down.

The complex role that legislatures play in evaluating constitutional questions is often overlooked. Like every government entity, Congress has the duty to assess the constitutionality of its actions, and to try to act consistently with constitutional requirements. It should not pass the buck to the courts, though it sometimes does. By facing constitutional issues itself, Congress can avoid problems and help shape the courts' analysis.

On the other hand, the courts cannot automatically defer to the judgment of Congress solely because it has considered carefully the constitutionality of its actions.

Sometimes Congress is wrong. Sometimes Congress' assessment of constitutional issues may be distorted because its own interests are at stake, or because it slights the rights of politically weak individuals or minorities. The courts have their own expertise—and unique detachment.

But where Congress considers a constitutional question seriously, and where Congress is not acting to aggrandize its own power or in disregard of minority interests, the courts will give substantial weight to its attempt to navigate the constitutional waters.

This is especially so in the separation of powers area, where the Constitution's language is vague and general. Here, the constitutionality of government action often turns on whether it addresses a strong practical need, if only because the Constitution is a charter of practical government.

Where the legislature is moved by those felt necessities and at the same time attempts to respond in a balanced manner to the underlying constitutional values at stake, the courts are not likely to stand in the way.

AISI POSITION ON NATURAL GAS ANTI-BYPASS LEGISLATION

HON. RALPH REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make several observations regarding the domestic steel industry and the challenges confronting it.

The American steel industry has sustained human and financial losses during this decade. Nearly \$11 billion has been lost by the industry since 1982. At least 25 companies, close to 20 percent of the market, have been forced into bankruptcy proceedings. This has resulted in employment being reduced by 67 percent since 1974, from over 500,000 to 170,000 jobs.

Despite these sobering statistics, the industry has begun to reverse this trend and now stands on the verge of a new era as an international leader in the production of steel. Over the past 6 years American companies have spent \$9 billion or 43 percent more than their cash flow on modernization. Furthermore, in 1987 more than 60 percent of steel was continuously cast, up from 13 percent 10 years earlier. Rising productivity combined with a modern production system indicate a new preeminence for American produced steel.

In viewing its role as ensuring a "level playing field" in the international marketplace, the U.S. Government acted to protect the steel industry in the early 1980's. The President implemented a program of voluntary restraint agreements, VRA's, to provide domestic producers with protected access to U.S. markets. This program has been successful by reducing the import penetration rate from 26.9 percent in 1984 to 21.8 percent in 1987.

Most experts agree that the President's program has allowed the domestic industry to regain its international competitiveness. The program is set to expire in September 1989.

Unfortunately, the same problems which confronted our producers in 1980 continue to exist. For example, in Japan the domestic market remains cartelized. Imports are restricted by domestic producers through pressure on distributors and customers. This is possible because of Japan's weak antitrust enforcement. Although the European Community has taken steps to enforce a ban on public sub-

sidies, the effectiveness of their actions are doubtful. There continue to exist widespread reports of clandestine subsidies, substantial State aid in the form of indirect transportation and labor schemes, in addition to the continued effects of past subsidization.

It is essential that Congress takes every effort to promote domestic steel production until "equity" is achieved with foreign producers. The continuation of the highly successful VRA program is critical to the industry but there are other equally important issues which have an impact upon the ability of the industry to compete. H.R. 3445, the natural gas anti-bypass legislation, would keep natural gas prices artificially high by discouraging local distribution companies to sell and transport gas at cost based rates. Mr. Joseph Toot, president of the Timken Co., correctly set forth the problems with this bill before the Steel Caucus last week. As spokesman for the American Iron and Steel Institute, he stated that gas prices could increase 25 to 100 percent. Such costs would eliminate the industry's profitability which was only recently restored in 1987. I ask that this incisive commentary be inserted into the House record following my statement.

STATEMENT BY JOSEPH TOOT, PRESIDENT, TIMKEN CO.: AISI POSITION ON NATURAL GAS ANTI-BYPASS LEGISLATION

WHAT'S THE ISSUE?

Antibypass legislation would remove a key incentive for local distribution companies (LDCs) to sell and transport gas at competitive, cost based rates. It would keep natural gas prices artificially high by preventing U.S. steel producers from purchasing some or all of their natural gas supplies directly from interstate pipelines.

WHAT'S THE COST IMPACT ON STEEL?

Last year, the industry used 396 billion cubic feet of natural gas at a cost of \$1.2 billion, or about 4.5 percent of the industry's total manufacturing cost—a significant cost element. Had U.S. steel companies last year been forced to pay LDC tariff rates, gas costs would have increased by 25-100 percent, and that would have increased steel's total manufacturing costs by 1-4 percentage points. It is interesting to note that the industry spends more on natural gas than it earned in profits in 1987. Legislation such as this would wipe out the profitability which we have all worked so hard to restore.

WHAT'S THE IMPACT ON STEEL'S INTERNATIONAL COMPETITIVENESS?

In today's global market where every dollar of cost savings counts, U.S. steel producers cannot afford to lose any part of their competitive advantage in any component of total costs. U.S. steel companies currently have a relative cost advantage in natural gas vis-a-vis their foreign competitors in Europe (where prices are as much as 35 percent higher) and Japan (as much as 200 percent higher). Pending anti-bypass legislation would potentially deprive U.S. steel producers of their current cost advantage in this critical area.

WHAT'S AISI'S POSITION?

AISI believes that the ability to bypass benefits all consumers, residential, commercial and industrial, because it forces LDCs to improve their service and cut costs. We strongly oppose H.R. 3445 for two main reasons: (1) it would eliminate this powerful incentive, and (2) it would damage the international competitive position of domestic steel producers.

H.R. 4127

HON. JIM JONTZ

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 4127, the American Heritage Trust Act which would serve as a successor to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Since 1964, the L&WCF has supported conservation and outdoor recreation projects at the Federal, State, and local level. Over 30,000 projects in every State, 5 territories, and the District of Columbia have been funded, constructed, operated, and maintained by L&WCF at a cost of more than \$6.8 billion. Most of this has been matched by State, local, and private contributions.

As a cosponsor of this bill it is my hope that the Congress will move quickly to pass this legislation. H.R. 4127 would continue the work done by the L&WCF that is enjoyed by almost all the people of our Nation.

To close my remarks I would like to insert the following two examples for how this program has benefited the people of my State.

GRAND KANKAKEE MARSH COUNTY PARK LAKE COUNTY, IN

In 1976, the Lake County, Indiana, Park and Recreation Board saw the need and opportunity to acquire and protect 873 acres of the small amount of wetlands remaining from the large marsh which once covered much of the northwestern corner of Indiana. The site borders the Kankakee River on the southern edge of Lake County. The Grand Kankakee Marsh was, and its surviving remnants still are, important not only for local wildlife and recreation in this heavily urbanized area, but also for migratory waterfowl in the Mississippi flyway. The Board sought help through a \$425,000 Land and Water Conservation Fund grant, which provided half the cost of the land acquisition. The park has since been developed with recreation facilities, and provided waterfowl habitat protection while offering numerous outdoor recreation activities, such as fishing, camping and natural and historical interpretation. The park was created through an exemplary mix of local, state, federal and private support which protected an important natural resource and will serve many urban and rural people.

TIPPECANOE RIVER STATE PARK AND BASS LAKE STATE BEACH

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF STATE PARKS

Tippecanoe River State Park, near the Town of Winamac in Pulaski County, lies along seven miles of the Tippecanoe River, which flows through northern Indiana. Small sand dunes, oak forests, pine plantations, and marshes form the park's terrain. The park was originally acquired by the National Park Service in the 1930s as part of the 7,353 acre Winamac Recreation Demonstration Area. In 1943 it was transferred to the Indiana Department of Natural Resources. The State manages the property in two portions, with the Division of State Parks operating 2,761 acres and the Division of Fish and Wildlife maintaining the other 4,592 acres as a state fish and wildlife area. Many of the state park facilities were built in the 1930s. Between 1974 and 1979

four Land and Water Conservation Fund grants totaling \$630,874 cost shared in the renovation of older existing facilities and the development of new improvements at the state park. Included in the construction projects were picnicking, playground, camping, bicycle, restroom, sewage and water treatment, office/information and maintenance facilities, and the adaptation of facilities for access by handicapped persons, which helped modernize and enhance this important state park.

Nearby in Starke County, Land and Water Conservation Fund grants totaling \$243,635 were used to renovate the bathhouse and a restroom, and build a playground and sewage treatment plant at Bass Lake State Beach near the Town of Knox. Bass Lake is Indiana's fourth largest natural lake, containing 1,345 acres, and is a popular recreation area for local residents and vacationers. Because there is no swimming available at Tippecanoe River State Park, Bass Lake State Beach serves as the swimming area for the nearby state park. The bathhouse at Bass Lake was built in the 1930s when the State acquired the site. The 21-acre Bass Lake State Beach provides swimming, picnicking and camping.

THE GREENHOUSE EFFECT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report for Wednesday, August 10, 1988, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE GREENHOUSE EFFECT

This summer's drought and record high temperatures have impressed on all of us once again the importance of reliable, predictable weather conditions. Much more than our personal comfort depends on the weather. Food production, water supply and transportation systems, energy consumption, and engineering designs are all geared towards particular climates, and are quickly disrupted by unusual weather conditions. While some claim that we are now just witnessing normal swings in temperatures, several scientists have been warning congressional committees recently that there is increasing evidence that the earth's climate is undergoing a global warming trend of historic proportions. Climate change has always been a part of the earth's natural history, but this time human action may be responsible.

Our planet is able to sustain life because of a mechanism known as the "greenhouse effect". The glass roof and sides of a greenhouse let the sun's heat through to warm the plants, but trap the heat inside, enabling the plants to grow. Similarly, carbon dioxide and the other gases making up the earth's atmosphere trap the heat from the sun and warm the earth's surface. Without the greenhouse effect, the earth's surface temperature would be 60 degrees Fahrenheit colder.

The problem is that human activities are now putting record amounts of gases which trap solar heat into the atmosphere, thus increasing the greenhouse effect and the future temperature of the earth's surface. Of particular concern is the buildup of carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels, such as coal, oil, and natural gas. Con-

centrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere have risen 25% since the Industrial Revolution of the 19th century. The rapid deforestation of the tropics has also been a major factor, as it leaves fewer trees to absorb carbon dioxide. Emissions of other gases and chemicals from industry and agriculture also compound the greenhouse effect.

Since 1850, the world's average temperature has risen about one degree. Estimates are that current trends of fossil fuel use will likely boost the average temperature three degrees by early in the next century, and possibly nine degrees within 100 years. The rate and magnitude of such an increase have never been experienced in human history. The effects of such warming are likely to include rising temperatures, expanding oceans, and changing precipitation patterns, although the precise size, timing, and direction of such changes are not known. These changes could result in longer, hotter summers, a shift northward of grain-growing regions, uncertain effects on crop yields, salt contamination of freshwater, and more frequent and stronger tropical storms. Some warn that the Great Plains could become a dust bowl, low-lying coastal cities could be flooded, and many of our national forests could be lost. Although it is still too early to link this summer's drought with the greenhouse effect, there is broad agreement among scientists that an overall warming trend is underway due to the greenhouse effect.

Since 1978, about \$1.2 billion has been spent by the federal government on the research and assistance activities of the National Climate Program. Annual greenhouse research funding by the U.S. now totals \$56 million, about 90% of the world total. The Congress also enacted provisions this year requiring the President to propose within two years a national policy on global climate change. An attempt to study the earth as one system—looking at interactions between the atmosphere, oceans, ice, land surfaces, and life forms—is also just beginning, with an international science program expected to be in operation by 1992.

Many scientists agree that we need to reduce greatly the burning of fossil fuels that emit carbon dioxide. They believe that we should begin now to decrease fuel use and increase energy efficiency. Shifting to solar, wind, water, and geothermal power can also decrease carbon dioxide emissions. Nuclear power does not emit carbon dioxide, and could replace some fossil fuel use if it can be made more economically and environmentally sound. Natural gas and oil produce lower carbon dioxide emissions than does coal, but they are more expensive. Slowing the deforestation of the tropics would also limit carbon dioxide emissions.

An international climate conference this year endorsed a 20% cut of carbon dioxide emissions by 2005, half from energy efficiency and half from using non-fossil fuels. Canadian and Norwegian representatives also called for a global Law of the Atmosphere treaty to stem pollution and to set up a trust fund from fossil fuel taxes to slow deforestation and encourage reforestation. These recommendations will be the basis for a 1990 United Nations meeting to lay the foundation for the first international agreement on climate change.

It is also time to reassess recent changes in U.S. energy policies. The Reagan energy program has gradually eliminated the 1970's promotion of alternative energy resources, and has shifted much of the work of the De-

partment of Energy from civilian energy programs to nuclear weapons development and production. Since 1980, federal funding for renewable energy research and development has been cut 85%, while energy conservation R&D has been cut 55%. Meanwhile, foreign countries continue to subsidize renewable energy technologies.

Responding to the greenhouse problem is a formidable challenge. Greenhouse warming of the climate is a global problem which cannot be solved by the U.S., or even by the industrial countries alone. Industrialized countries were developed through extensive use of fossil fuels and deforestation. Developing countries object to proposals which would restrict their opportunities. Moreover, methods of limiting emissions are expensive. Some argue that we should not take any action until we know more about the precise effects of global warming. Yet the feeling is growing, especially after the searing summer of 1988, that taking steps now to slow the rate of warming is critical. The longer we delay acting, the more difficult it will be to contain and adjust to the adverse consequences of the greenhouse effect.

THE OMNIBUS DRUG INITIATIVE OF 1988

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the on-going drug crisis threatens the cohesion of our society more profoundly than any other issue confronting the Congress. Drug abuse is not a new problem; but the development of crack cocaine has broadened the scope of drug abuse and drug-related crime, while the emergence of AIDS has greatly increased the costs to society of IV drug abuse.

One consequence of these two new problems, crack and AIDS, has been the emergence of new populations at high risk; adolescents, and women, and their young children.

Reflecting an increased level of concern about adolescent drug abuse, a recent survey found that the No. 1 policy priority among directors of State alcohol and drug abuse programs was to develop and expand programs for teenagers. And while illicit drug use by high school seniors appears to be declining, a majority of the class of 1987 had tried an illicit drug, and over a third had tried an illicit drug other than marijuana. Unfortunately, these figures tell us nothing about drug abuse by high school dropouts, among whom drug abuse is most likely more prevalent.

Meanwhile, the link between adolescent drug abuse and crime is growing stronger. An estimated 35 percent of arrested juveniles in the District of Columbia, 42 percent in Maricopa County (Phoenix), AZ, and 35 percent in Tampa, FL, test positive for illicit drug use. Here in Washington, cocaine use among juvenile arrestees has increased from less than 1 percent in 1984 to 22 percent in 1987.

On the supply side of the drug question, we confront an escalating epidemic of drug-related gang violence, spurred on by the spread of crack cocaine and the disintegration of support systems for at-risk youth and their fami-

lies. The easy profits reaped from crack have transformed youth gangs into small, extremely violent units of organized crime, structured to maximize the flow of drug dollars.

Rather than seeking to protect their neighborhood turf as in years past, gangs from Los Angeles, Chicago, and Miami are spreading out across the Nation in search of virgin markets for their goods. The Drug Enforcement Administration reports that Los Angeles gang members selling narcotics have surfaced in 49 U.S. cities.

The other new vulnerable population, low-income women of childbearing age, are at increased risk of both drug addiction, because of crack, and AIDS, because while they will likely not use IV drugs, they may well have sexual partners who do.

Moreover, if women are pregnant and use crack or IV drugs or contract AIDS, their children frequently share the consequences. Children under 5 are now one of the fastest growing segments of Americans with AIDS; and a substantial majority are infected perinatally by parents who use, or who have sexual partners who use, IV drugs. And according to experts testifying before the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, more and more women are using cocaine during pregnancy.

These trends are tragic, for these infants, if they survive, frequently face great difficulties in their development.

These trends are also extremely expensive. An infant born to a drug-addicted mother will likely spend 4 to 6 weeks in the intensive care nursery at a cost, minimally, of about \$28,000. Hospital care for infants born with AIDS can cost more than \$200,000 per child.

Furthermore, the New York Times recently reported that crack is having a powerfully destructive effect upon low-income, single-parent families. Women in general have been more reluctant to use IV drugs than men, and this has protected their children. Yet crack is easier to use and more addictive and growing numbers of low-income single mothers are becoming addicted to it, thus leaving their children neglected.

In addition to these direct human and monetary costs of drug abuse, we are also faced with secondary costs. Urban foster care agencies tell us they are increasingly burdened by babies who are born with AIDS or addicted to drugs and then abandoned in hospitals by their mothers.

These are intimidating problems yet we are not without resources or successful models to build upon.

Comprehensive programs in Chicago and Los Angeles that provide medical and psychotherapeutic care for drug-addicted pregnant women have dramatically improved the outcomes of these pregnancies and reduced the costs of caring for the infants.

The omnibus drug initiative contains several important provisions that respond to the drug crisis among children, women, and youth; and it allows us to build upon what we know.

I am particularly pleased that the bill establishes drug abuse education and prevention programs targeted to youth gangs. Further, it orients resources for the development of more effective juvenile justice programs targeted to the illicit use of drugs by youth and to provide

juveniles and their families referral to education, prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation.

The bill also initiates a new National Youth Sports Program for disadvantaged youth, which will include drug abuse education and prevention activities.

Adolescents and children will also be well served by a 20-percent set-aside in the alcohol and drug abuse prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation services block grant for prevention activities, including early intervention programs and activities.

The omnibus drug initiative also authorizes several key programs to target women at risk. For instance, funds are earmarked for model projects for pregnant and postpartum women and their infants; the National Institute for Drug Abuse is directed to conduct research and demonstration projects designed to develop more effective treatments for pregnant and postpartum women and their infants; and 6 percent of the alcohol and drug abuse prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation services block grant is set aside specifically for services for women.

This legislation addresses the urgent needs of tens of millions of Americans who abuse drugs. It is especially crucial to high-risk youth and to high-risk women and their children. Providing intervention and prevention services to these populations will prove far less costly than relegating them to lives of drug addiction or crime, or to death from AIDS.

At the same time as it addresses the prevention and treatment needs of Americans, this legislation sends a firm message to those who engage in the smuggling, transport or sale of illegal drugs.

We cannot confuse the needs of those who are the victims of drug abuse with the crimes of those who profiteer from the drug trade. We must act swiftly and vigorously against those who perpetrate drug violence and drug abuse.

That is the value of this legislation. It offers both prevention and tough enforcement, assistance and firm punishment. Together, those efforts represent a determined effort to rid our society of the tragedy and violence of drugs.

A TRIBUTE TO PASTOR BARNEY LEONE AND CHRISTIAN ASSEMBLY CHURCH

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in order to pay tribute to Pastor Barney P. Leone and the Christian Assembly Church of my 17th Congressional District. It is one of my proudest and most humbling moments as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives to be able to announce that not only is this the 25th anniversary of Barney Leone's tenure as pastor of the Christian Assembly Church, but this is also the 50th anniversary of the Christian Assembly Church. A gala dinner celebration is being planned to celebrate these two momentous anniversaries on September 9, 1988, at Cesta's Golden Gate Restaurant in Warren, OH.

The Christian Assembly Church is located on Regal Drive in Warren, OH, and I must say that it is one of the most beautiful churches in Turbun County. Pastor Barney Leone is an extremely kind and generous person, and through his church he is building a strong moral fabric for the Warren community. It is very exhilarating for me to know that there exists in my 17th Congressional District a church leader as devoted to helping humanity and to spreading the word of God as Pastor Barney Leone, and that there are parishioners as worshipful and compassionate as those of the Christian Assembly Church.

I tip my hat in salute to Pastor Barney Leone and the wonderful congregation of the Christian Assembly Church on their proud history and record of accomplishment, and it is my deepest desire that the Christian Assembly Church's next 50 years and Barney Leone's next 25 years as Pastor of that church are even more successful than their first era has been. Thus, it is with thanks and special pleasure that I join with the people of the 17th Congressional District in paying tribute to the outstanding individuals who comprise the Christian Assembly Church and to the dynamic leadership of Pastor Barney P. Leone.

J. SKELLY WRIGHT

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, some may find it difficult to believe that just a little more than 25 years ago Federal judges who ordered school integration required police guards to protect them.

The fact that his life was threatened, that crosses were burned on his front lawn, and that friends of long standing refused to speak to him, never seemed to deter the late Judge J. Skelly Wright from upholding the Constitution as he saw it.

Judge Wright's view held that "racially and socially homogeneous schools damage the minds and spirits of all the children who attend them—Negro, the white, the poor and the affluent—and block the attainment of the broader goals of democratic education."

Most Americans take this view for granted today, but there was not the case in Judge Wright's native New Orleans in 1960.

Judge Wright ordered an end to segregation of the New Orleans public schools and his order integrated not only the city schools but its universities, parks, buses, sporting events, and voting lists.

Later, as a Federal Appeals Court Judge for the District of Columbia he called segregation in the District schools "criminal".

Judge Wright was the sole dissenter when the court of appeals blocked the release of the Pentagon papers at the request of the White House.

Judge Wright's view was upheld 11 days later, however, when the Supreme Court ruled that the first amendment required the release of the Pentagon papers to the Washington Post and the New York Times.

Wright called the Government's efforts to stop the public disclosure of the Pentagon papers "the suppressing of our most precious freedom."

Many whites in the South called him a "traitor" to his class, some called him Judas. President Kennedy named him to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia because he feared Wright wouldn't be confirmed for a seat on the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in New Orleans.

Judge Wright saw in the Constitution, protection for even the most unpopular causes.

While others were silent, he was willing to risk his life and career for the country and the Constitution.

He saw in America's diversity its strength.

Millions who will never know his name are in debt to J. Skelly Wright.

TRIBUTE TO "THE GREENGROCER"—JOE CARCIONE

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the death of Joe Carcione who must surely have been the most famous greengrocer in America. As an expert on fruit and vegetables, he delighted millions of listeners in 34 television markets with his advice on the best buys of the day. He was widely admired for his straightforward honesty. He once told a reporter "I'm going to tell the truth. If I can't do what is right, I'm going to get off the air." Joe Carcione was on the air for over 20 years.

Joe Carcione got his start in the produce business in 1933 working with his father, Peter, in the family market in the North Beach area of San Francisco. Later the business moved to the Golden Gate Produce Terminal in south San Francisco. Mr. Carcione went to work at 5 a.m., strolling through the 14-acre terminal, sampling fresh fruit and vegetables while chatting with employees and making notes for his listeners and readers.

In 1967, he began doing his own radio commercials on KCBS. He was approached to do daily news reports on produce which were quickly syndicated nationwide. Millions of Americans will miss Mr. Carcione's distinctive, gravelly voice when they decide which fruits and vegetables to buy.

For several years Mr. Carcione had been battling intestinal cancer. Although he eventually lost the fight, his work as consumer advocate will not be forgotten.

HAITI ABUSES CONTINUE UNDER MILITARY DICTATORSHIP

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, a reign of terror continues in Haiti.

Gen. Henri Namphy, the self-appointed dictator of Haiti, recently decreed the Constitution establishing democracy in 1987 null and void, further tightening his iron fist of military control.

On July 10 Lafontant Joseph, a founder of the Center for the Promotion of Human Rights, was found brutally murdered in his jeep near the airport road, a dumping ground for victims of political assassinations.

It appears the narrow window of democracy opened by the forced removal of dictator Francois Duvalier has closed in Haiti. It's yet another sad chapter in the history of a country with one of the worst human rights records in the Western Hemisphere.

The United States must do all it can to end human rights abuses in Haiti, to end the extreme poverty of its people, and to end its military dictatorship.

As the letter to the editor of the New York Times indicates below, the media must not ignore continuing human rights abuse in Haiti. IN HAITI, ONCE AGAIN, MURDER IN THE NIGHT To the Editor:

I note with distress that you have not reported the murder of the Haitian human rights advocate and lawyer Lafontant Joseph in Port-au-Prince on the night of July 10. Mr. Joseph was a respected member of the Haitian bar and founder of the Center for the Promotion of Human Rights. He was an author of a June 30 joint statement by Haitian human rights advocates calling for a return to constitutional norms. After repeated threats against his life and the lives of his family, he was found knifed and shot to death in his jeep near the airport road, a favorite dumping spot for victims of political assassinations during the reign of Francois Duvalier.

Mr. Joseph's murder, which few doubt was politically motivated, followed a July 4 attack on the home of Laennec Hurbon, a Haitian intellectual. Mr. Hurbon has ties to a major center-left political organization in Haiti, and he is working on a study of religious movements in the Caribbean. At about 2 A.M., his house was searched and ransacked by four men carrying Uzis and walkie-talkies. They seemed particularly interested in Mr. Hurbon's work, going through his notes and tearing apart his library. As in the earliest Duvalier days, the men wore black hoods to avoid recognition and to instill fear.

A few days before Mr. Joseph's murder, Gen. Henri Namphy (now the self-proclaimed President) decreed that the democratic Constitution of 1987 was null and void. Mr. Joseph's murder seems an obvious second act to that declaration. We can only wonder what will happen in Act III of General Namphy's military dictatorship.—AMY WILENTZ, New York, July 20, 1988.

A TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH GEORGE OF CLINTON, MI

HON. BILL SCHUETTE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate one of my constituents, Joseph George, for his acceptance into the Michigan Farmer's Hall of Fame. Joseph will be inducted into this

prestigious organization on September 2 of this year.

Established in 1982, the Michigan Farmer's Hall of Fame honors farmers for their contributions to their community and to Michigan's agriculture industry. Being inducted into the hall of fame is a high honor and Joseph has evidently demonstrated his talents and commitment to be worthy of acclamation.

Joseph is a resident of Clinton, MI, and was an active farmer for 52 years before retiring. During his career, Joseph owned nearly 160 acres, and grew a variety of crops including: soybeans, corn, wheat, and oats. He also had about 400 hogs.

Born in 1915 on his great-grandfather's farm in Clinton MI, Joseph grew up helping his father with the family farm. As his interest in farming increased, he began learning more about the family business. Then in 1940, his father sold the farm to Joseph and his wife, Rita. Continuing the family tradition of farming, Joseph and Rita enjoyed 52 years in the business.

While a most talented and dedicated farmer, Joseph has never taken his successes for granted, nor disregarded the help he has received from others. On his questionnaire submitted to the hall of fame, Joseph attributes his good fortune and success in farming to hard work, good health, and the help of his sons.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you and our colleagues will join me in commending and congratulating Joseph George upon his induction into the Michigan Farmer's Hall of Fame next month. Agriculture is a vital industry in our State and to be recognized as a leader in the agriculture community, by your peers, and your community is a high honor. Please join me in offering our congratulations and best wishes to Joseph George and his family on this joyous occasion.

ABROGATE THE PANAMA CANAL TREATIES

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a House joint resolution with Senator STEVEN SYMMS that will show a sense of Congress that the Panama Canal Treaty needs to be abrogated. This treaty not only cost us our canal, but cost the taxpayers of America billions of dollars given to the Panamanian Government to take this vital piece of American property off our hands. To the Carter administration, this action was designed to redress an ancient grievance and to ingratiate the United States not just with Panama, but with our other Latin American neighbors as well. Further, the Carter people argued that the canal was increasingly obsolete and the fears registered by American critics of the treaty over the inability of the Panamanian Government to both maintain and operate the canal were grossly exaggerated. In addition, we were told, the revenues pouring into Panama, which was hurting economically, would provide the basis not just for improving that nation's economic

welfare, but also for laying the foundation for a stable Panamanian democracy with close ties to the United States. Finally, we were assured that the United States would reserve a right to guarantee the protection of the canal in perpetuity.

Obviously, with the current situation involving General Noriega and his drug-dealing government, Panama is a land of unrest. Fortunately, the United States still controls and owns the strategically vital Panama Canal. A number of facts which have surfaced since President Carter and the Senate agreed to give away the Panama Canal have led to a public outcry. It is time that the Members of Congress reexamine the facts and understand that the Panama Canal Treaty was never properly ratified.

The problems with the ratification process were numerous. I have included a list which explains eight key points that prove most conclusively that this sense of the Congress is the needed action for this country.

1. CONFLICTING RESERVATIONS

The text of the treaties as signed was not completely acceptable to the U.S. Senate, which was charged with ratification under the Constitution. In ratifying the treaties, several reservations were attached to clarify the meaning which the Senate placed on the treaties' provisions which were ratified.

Chief among these was the so-called "DeConcini Reservation," introduced by Senator Dennis DeConcini (D-Ariz.), which declared that the United States right of intervention to guarantee the neutrality of the canal could be exercised unilaterally, without a prior request by the government of Panama and, if necessary, against the opposition of the government of Panama.

The DeConcini Reservation was strongly opposed by the Panamanian negotiators, who inserted a three paragraph counter-reservation into their instrument of ratification, asserting that it was the understanding of Panama that the DeConcini Reservation did not allow for unilateral U.S. action, despite the clear intentions to the contrary expressed in the Senate debate.

This Panamanian counter-reservation was never presented to the Senate for a vote (as required by the Constitution) and is not mentioned in the U.S. instrument of ratification. Clearly, the ratification was faulty and the treaties are void.

2. ILLEGALITY UNDER THE VIENNA CONVENTION

The Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969) is generally recognized as the codification of the international law of treaties. Under Article 20.2 of the Convention, each reservation required the acceptance of the other party. Since neither reservation was accepted by the other party (indeed, since they are mutually exclusive) there has been no ratification under international law.

3. NO TRANSFER OF SOVEREIGNTY

Article I of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 purports to terminate all previous canal treaties and states "... the Republic of Panama, as territorial sovereign. ..." There is no provision in the 1977 treaty which explicitly transfers sovereignty from the United States back to Panama.

The U.S. Supreme Court in 1907 concluded that the provisions of the 1903 treaty had granted sovereignty over the Canal Zone to the United States. Clearly then, some affirmative act was required to transfer sovereignty back to Panama. The abro-

gation of the 1903 treaty alone was not sufficient. Since the rest of the treaties cannot be constructed in any way with sovereignty remaining with the United States, the treaties must be void in their entirety.

4. IMPROPER ABROGATION OF THE 1903 TREATY

As noted above, the 1977 treaty purports to rescind the provisions of the 1903 treaty. This is improper. The clear intent of the framers of the Constitution was for the Executive Branch to negotiate treaties, which would be ratified by the Senate (2/3 vote) and then become laws, just like other laws, which could only be repealed through the standard legislative process in both Houses of Congress.

If a treaty could be declared invalid by the President and the Senate, without the House of Representatives, then treaties would not be the "supreme law of the land" as guaranteed by Article VI. The principle is analogous to that which the U.S. Supreme Court used in 1983 to overturn the "legislative veto."

Since the House of Representatives never approved legislation abrogating the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903, it remains in force; and the conflicting language of the 1977 Treaty is void.

5. IMPROPER DISPOSAL OF U.S. PROPERTY

As noted above, the U.S. Supreme Court in 1907 found that the Canal Zone was the property of the United States. Under Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution, "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. ..." Therefore, U.S. property can only be conveyed through the normal legislative process (both Houses of Congress).

On September 27, 1979, President Carter signed into law Public Law 96-70, The Panama Canal Act of 1979, the only legislative vehicle pertaining to the Canal Treaties which was passed by both Houses of Congress. Key provisions of this law are Sec. 1503, "No property of the United States located in Panama may be disposed of except by law enacted by the Congress," and Sec. 1504(c), "the Panama Canal ... shall not be transferred to the Republic of Panama prior to December 31, 1999."

Under this law, then, the Panama Canal and Zone still belong to the United States and will continue to belong to the United States until Congress, both Houses of Congress, passes a law disposing of it. Provisions of the Panama Canal Treaties to the contrary must be void.

6. NON-RESIDENT ALIENS AS U.S. OFFICIALS

Article III of the Panama Canal Treaty (1977) provides for the President of the United States to appoint four Panamanians to serve as directors on the nine-member Panama Canal Commission, the government agency which operates the canal.

The U.S. Constitution requires that all officers of the United States must swear an oath to support the U.S. Constitution (Article VI, Section 3) and may be removed for treason (Article II, Section 4).

These Constitutional provisions clearly do not allow for non-resident aliens to serve as officers of the United States. Such an alien cannot take an oath to support the United States Constitution and, by definition, cannot commit treason against the United States. Therefore, this provision of the Panama Canal Treaty is unconstitutional.

7. IMPROPER APPLICATION OF PANAMANIAN CONSTITUTION

The Panamanians had long expected the 1903 Treaty to eventually be renegotiated, and made provision for it in the Constitution of Panama (1972). Article 274 provided that "Treaties ... with respect to the Panama Canal ... shall be submitted to a national plebiscite" for ratification. Accordingly, the treaties signed by President Carter and General Torrijos were submitted to a plebiscite by Panamanian Law 33 and approved on October 23, 1977.

However, the subsequent U.S. reservations and Panamanian counter-reservations (see above) were never submitted to a second plebiscite. The versions of the treaties ratified by the people of Panama in the October 1977 plebiscite are not the same as the versions ratified by the United States in March and April of 1978; and both are different from the versions ratified by General Torrijos in June of 1978. Since the ratification was unconstitutional under the Constitution of Panama, the treaties are void.

8. IMPROPER SIGNING UNDER PANAMANIAN CONSTITUTION

Article 277 of the Constitution of Panama (1972) stipulates that the "Head of Government," then Omar Torrijos, had the power to "direct foreign relations," while Article 163 reserved to the "president of the Republic alone" the power to "enter into international treaties and agreements."

Despite this, the 1977 treaties were signed by General Torrijos, not the President of Panama. For this reason, the treaties are void under Panamanian law.

It is time that the Members of Congress and the President of the United States abrogate the Panama Canal Treaties. We must return to the American people, a canal which their loved ones built, operated, and defended. It not only is the right action to take, but the moral action as well.

REMEMBERING THE PLAISTED EXPEDITION

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the people of my State, Minnesota, like much of the rest of the country, are suffering through the hottest, driest summer in many, many years. However, just over 20 years ago, a group of Minnesotans faced a very different challenge. On April 19, 1968, the Plaisted Polar Expedition reached the North Pole, setting a record for the earliest indisputable attainment of the Pole over the sea ice.

The story of the Plaisted Expedition is told in the following article by Tom Dennis of the Duluth News Tribune, which looks back at the adventure with one of the participants, a friend of mine, Dr. Authur Aufderheide of Duluth.

I sincerely hope that the courage and fortitude shown by these Arctic pioneers 20 years ago will in some small way encourage Americans who are facing the challenges of this summer's severe drought.

[From the Duluth News-Tribune, Apr. 18, 1988]

20 YEARS HAVEN'T COOLED MEMORY OF ARCTIC TREK

(By Tom Dennis)

A group of unkempt, exhausted explorers, their parkas stark against the Arctic snow, their frostbitten faces cracking into smiles as they stand on the top of the world: the North Pole. . . . You've seen that picture before.

Or have you? When this snap-shot was taken, Lyndon Johnson was president. "The Beverly Hillbillies" was on prime-time TV, and explorer Will Steger was only 23 years old.

Twenty years ago Tuesday, an insurance salesman, a teacher and two other relative amateurs became the first men since discoverer Robert E. Peary to cross the ice to the North Pole.

And for most of the trip, Duluth's Dr. Author Aufderheide was there.

Aufderheide, now 65, was not only a charter member of the Plaisted Polar Expedition of 1968, the snowmobile expedition that successfully reached the pole on April 19, 1968. He was also a member of the Plaisted Polar Expedition of 1967, a year earlier. That's the one that was aborted scarcely 100 miles onto the ice.

"We made so many mistakes that first time," Aufderheide said Friday, looking at the huge map of the Arctic that dominates his office at the UMD School of Medicine.

None of the men had any experience on the icecap them. Of course, that wasn't unusual in 1967, since virtually no one on the planet had such experience.

All they had was grit, determination, a few weeks of training on Minnesota's frozen Lake Mille Lacs and the vision of their leader, St. Paul insurance salesman Ralph Plaisted.

"The result was that we took all this bad advice," Aufderheide said. "It was given very considerably and thoughtfully, by people who were trying to help. But it was wrong."

They left northern Canada too late in the season. They hauled sleds piled so high with equipment that when one tipped over, several people would be required to right it. They started with seven tents and ended with one.

"We got 100 miles out onto the ice and ran out of winter," Aufderheide said.

But a leaner, meaner Plaisted expedition set out to beat the same odds a year later, on March 7, 1968. And 44 days later, they won.

Although Aufderheide was among the six snowmobilers who started the second expedition, supply problems forced his evacuation mid-route. He was at the base camp in Canada when the group reached the pole.

Nevertheless, Aufderheide's experiences left him with a keen appreciation for the Arctic world, especially the challenges faced by explorers such as Ely's Will Steger. Steger led a team that reached the pole by dogsled, unsupported by aircraft, in 1986.

For example, all arctic explorers face the challenge of temperature. "Down to about 40 below zero, things don't change," he said. "It's cumbersome to tie a knot at 40 below, but you can do it."

"At 70 below, you plan."

You tie your knot twist by twist, dashing your hands out of your mittens for a swipe at a time. Even so, your hands still steam when they hit the air.

"I had to repair a rip in the tent once," he said. "It was one stitch at a time."

Taking pictures at 70 below is another fiasco, he said. "In fact," Aufderheide laughed, "you want to see the most common stance for an Arctic photographer?"

Aufderheide stood, then thrust his hands down the front of his pants. "I'm serious. You've got to get those hands warm."

The experiences of the Plaisted expeditions, which were recorded in books and a CBS-TV documentary, doubtless helped Steger and other explorers who followed.

"I would never say Steger couldn't have done it without us," Aufderheide said. For one thing, Steger is an exceptionally creative and adaptable man, who himself could have handled the problems Plaisted encountered, he said.

"For another, Steger had a whole set of problems of his own," he said. "We were resupplied by aircraft. He wasn't."

"But I like to think that we saved him from some problems," Aufderheide said.

Today Aufderheide follows Steger's latest exploits with interest.

"The whole exploring business is, of course, irrational," he said. "You can't judge it by any standard logic."

But there's something deeply reassuring about having the Plaisted and the Stegers around, he said. Witness the intense public interest in the adventures of both men.

"We all feel the need to renew our contact with nature," Aufderheide said. "We're all living beings, living masses of protoplasm. We need reassurance that something in us remains in contact with nature—sometimes facing nature on its own terms, giving it the upper hand."

"We can't all go out and live in 70-below-zero weather," he said. "But I think we identify with people who can."

INFANT MORTALITY

HON. J. ROY ROWLAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to present to the House the final report of the National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality.

It is a shocking fact that, in saving the lives of babies, America ranks 19th among the nations of the world.

We have made outstanding achievements in medical technology, but still 40,000 American infants are dead each year before their first birthday.

For the past year, the National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality has probed the experiences of the Nation's parents and professionals for answers.

What we found is that many infants are born too small, many are born too soon, many mothers never get decent care and guidance during their pregnancy.

We need to invest the kind of resources that provide preventive health care rather than waiting to provide costly "rescue" treatment later.

This report calls for universal access to early, comprehensive maternity and infant care. Second, it describes the need to make children's health and well-being a front-row national priority—not just to recognize the problem but to reach the people who need the help.

The Commission believes the Nation has the means to help the children and the means justify a new beginning. We need to weld the resources of medicine, government, and community into a commitment and a capacity to care for mothers and infants.

I would like to submit a copy of the final report of the National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Two major steps must be taken immediately if the United States is to activate our fight against infant mortality and if we are to assure our children and mothers the health and well-being that are their right.

First, we must provide universal access to early maternity and pediatric care for all mothers and infants. The existing financial, administrative, logistical, geographical, educational, and social barriers to essential health services for pregnant women and infants must be eliminated. Employers must make available health insurance coverage that includes maternity and well-baby care. Government must assume responsibility for those who lack private insurance or are unable to pay.

Second, we must initiate immediately a sustained, broadbased effort to make the health and well-being of mothers and infants a national priority and give them the public attention and resources they deserve.

These broad courses of action are the major recommendations of this report. To implement these goals, federal, state, and local governments, business and industry, community organizations, and the public and private sector health care communities must assume the responsibility for specific actions. The recommendations offered in this report represent a strategy which can make a difference.

EVERY MOTHER AND EVERY BABY MUST BE ABLE TO GET THE HEALTH CARE THEY NEED

UNIVERSAL ACCESS

Every baby should have the right to a healthy start in life. No pregnant woman or infant should go without preventive health services because avenues to care are blocked. Front-end maternity and early infant care are matters of life and death. They are far too important to allow anyone to fall through the cracks. Unless we make a commitment to providing universal access to maternity and infant care, the financial and human cost of infant mortality and morbidity will continue to climb. So will the cost to society of supporting the care and treatment of unhealthy children who, through no fault of their own, grow up with long-term disabilities or have difficulty becoming self-supporting adults.

The Commission holds that every pregnant woman and infant should be able to get the health care they need.

There must be no financial barriers to care.

The health of a pregnant woman or infant should never depend solely on wealth. Health care should not be limited to those with the ability to pay. To the maximum extent possible, the private sector should make available health insurance coverage, with the government being the provider of last resort as resources become available.

There must be no geographic or administrative barriers to care.

In some rural areas, the closest health care facilities are hundreds of miles away.

Often, mothers and infants needing help have no way of getting to or from a clinic.

Women seeking to enter medical or other public assistance programs are often forced to wait as long as 30 to 60 days while their case is considered. Often, pregnant mothers and their small children must wait hours to receive much needed services. Many mothers just give up out of frustration.

Where no services are available, public health departments or local hospitals should establish them. Where there are long forms to fill out, waiting lists, hard to reach clinics, poor transportation, lack of child care services, or other administrative barriers to care, agencies should knock down those barriers.

We must provide early care that is high-quality, readily accessible, and appropriate to the health risks presented.

Pregnant women and infants must be guaranteed maternity and infant care as early as possible—women as soon as they know they are pregnant, infants as soon as they are born. Health services—prenatal, delivery, and pediatric—should be coordinated, comprehensive, sensitive to cultural differences, and consistent with accepted health care standards.

THIS NATION MUST MAKE THE HEALTH AND WELL-BEING OF MOTHERS AND BABIES A TOP PRIORITY

If the health and well-being of pregnant women, new mothers and infants is currently a national priority at all, it is far down the list. We are willing to spend an unlimited amount of money to keep low birth-weight babies alive once they are born, but we are strangely reluctant to spend far less on the front-end preventive care that would make heroic, glamorous and expensive efforts to save young lives unnecessary. The consequence is that too many of our youngest children are dying. Our infant mortality rate is irrefutable evidence that although we care, we do not care enough. It is time we made a visible, tangible commitment to our children's health, to their quality of life, and to our nation's future—because it is cost-effective, and more importantly, because it is right.

The Commission recommends that a national campaign to bring infant mortality to the forefront of our country's awareness be launched and that there be established a permanent national council on children's health and well-being to focus efforts on preventing infant mortality and reducing infant morbidity.

FIRST STEPS FOR REDUCING INFANT MORTALITY

FINANCING CARE: PAY NOW OR PAY LATER

Comprehensive maternity and infant care saves lives and money: those facts are well documented. We can spend the money now or we can spend a lot more later.

This nation's hospital bill for keeping low birthweight babies alive during their first year of life can be as high as \$2 billion a year. The cost of providing front-end prenatal care for those women who do not currently receive it could be as little as \$500 million.

One of the main reasons millions of pregnant women and infants do not get the health care they need is simply because they cannot afford it. Most Americans finance health care with insurance provided by through their employer. But a job does not guarantee that a woman or her family will automatically have health insurance, or

that the insurance they have will cover all their needs.

In 1985, 9.5 million women of childbearing age had no health insurance. More than 7 million of these women were married to workers or had jobs themselves. More than 20 percent of all children without health insurance lived with a parent who was insured through work.

Even those who have private insurance must often pay substantial out-of-pocket expenses, especially if their coverage specifies cost-sharing for maternity and well-baby care benefits, or if it restricts coverage for new policyholders who have personal or family histories of medical conditions such as diabetes. Some policies simply do not cover maternity care at all. In 1987, five million women of childbearing age had private health insurance that did not cover maternity care.

A PLAN OF ACTION

Public Sector

The Medicaid program should be expanded to cover all pregnant women and infants who have family incomes at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty level.

Assets tests for pregnant women applying for Medicaid should be eliminated. As of July 1988, 16 states still considered assets, such as a family automobile, in computing eligibility.

Eligibility in Medicaid for pregnant women and infants should be continuous throughout the infant's first year of life.

Private Sector

The private sector should make available prenatal and pediatric health care. All employment-based health insurance should include maternity and well-baby care coverage for employees, their spouses and dependents.

Self-employed and unincorporated businesses should be allowed to deduct the full cost of health insurance as a business expense. Corporations already do this.

To increase the availability and affordability of private group health insurance for small employers, insurance pooling mechanisms should be established.

Women must be made aware of the full array of available services as soon as they become pregnant. It would be best if pregnant women and infants could secure all necessary services at one location. At a minimum, there must be coordination of programs including Medicaid; Title V Maternal and Child Health Programs; the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC); Community and Migrant Health Centers; social and welfare services; mental health and mental retardation services; substance abuse, prevention and rehabilitation; special education; and family planning services.

Congress should require that all Medicaid-eligible infants be automatically enrolled at birth in the Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) program. Currently, fewer than half of eligible children receive any EPSDT services. States should also be required to offer follow-up services for any problems identified in the screenings.

The Medicaid application forms must be simplified and states should adopt a streamlined eligibility process, such as "presumptive eligibility" under which all pregnant women applying for Medicaid would be immediately eligible for services for up to 45 days or until the formal application is denied or accepted, whichever is sooner. As

of July 1988, only 19 states had adopted the presumptive eligibility process.

The number of providers willing to serve high-risk pregnant women and infants must be increased and the malpractice crisis must be addressed. The Commission encourages the development of demonstration projects to test innovative ways to increase the participation of obstetricians, family physicians, pediatricians and certified nurse midwives in Medicaid and underserved communities.

In order to encourage more maternity and pediatric providers to participate in the Medicaid program, states should examine ways to adjust their Medicaid reimbursement rates and simplify the administrative requirements.

A "home visitors program" for pregnant women and new mothers, particularly those in high-risk populations, should be established. The program could educate and work with pregnant women throughout their pregnancies to promote healthy outcomes. Community organizations and volunteers could be trained to encourage healthy behavior and to refer pregnant women and infants to appropriate services.

INVESTING IN CHILDREN— INVESTING IN AMERICA

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the opportunity to address the Contra Costa Council, an organization of key business leaders in the Seventh District of California.

The central theme of my speech was this: America doesn't have any children to waste if we are to be a productive, innovative, and competitive society in the 21st century.

We have the knowledge to assure that every American child has the opportunity to succeed—through good health, sound development, educational opportunity, and economic security. The only issue is whether we will utilize that knowledge or continue to consign one-fifth of our young people to fail.

My address follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN GEORGE MILLER, SEVENTH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA, TO THE CONTRA COSTA COUNCIL, AUGUST 6, 1988

I'm delighted to have the opportunity to come before the Contra Costa Council again to share some thoughts about Federal policies and our economic situation.

Of course, the Presidential election is going to be very important in setting that course.

But there are complex issues—fiscal issues, policy issues, and ideological issues—that go beyond this one election and address the future of the American economy in the decades to come.

The No. 1 topic in American politics today is children: their education, their families, and health care.

As most of you know, those are very important subjects to me, as chairman of the House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families.

So I'm delighted that children are receiving this attention, because these issues raise some of the most fundamental questions

about the role of Government and the future of this country.

Children today face a litany of problems which present difficult challenges to the future economic prosperity, growth and competitiveness of America.

We are losing millions of our children. We are losing them to drugs, to homelessness, to school dropouts and to teen pregnancy.

We are losing them to child abuse, to poverty, to AIDS and to infant mortality.

We must look behind the rosy economic indicators, at the real condition of millions of young Americans.

During the early 1980's, poverty among families with children rose 37 percent. Even among two-parent families, poverty rose over 50 percent.

Today, one-fifth of all children—13 million Americans under the age of 18—1.3 million California children—are growing up poor, overwhelmed by all of poverty's attendant health, educational, and developmental consequences.

Two of every three poor children are white.

Many poor children are living in the fastest growing family arrangement: single parent families.

In California, one-sixth of all children live in a family headed by a single mother—and half of them are living in poverty.

More women in the workplace mean changing child care needs in the home. And tax credits or moralizing aside, women will not disappear from the workplaces because they can't afford to. Not for the luxuries of life, but for the necessities. And even so, many are barely getting by.

Eight percent of women workers earn less than \$20,000 a year. And even in half the homes where there are two wage earners, the husband is earning less than \$20,000.

Nearly 40 million Americans lack any health care coverage at all. A 31 percent increase since 1980, and 12 million of them are children.

Over the past 8 years, 750,000 children have lost access to their only health program, and nearly 25 percent of all children are born to mothers who have had no prenatal care at all.

Is it any wonder that we have made little progress on preventing infant mortality, as the bipartisan National Commission on infant mortality disclosed yesterday.

Tens of thousands of those babies are born at high medical risk of death and disability because of low birthweight. Yet nearly 70 percent of the medically certified, high risk mothers in California cannot participate in the WIC Program that dramatically reduces the chances of low birthweight.

That tragic record is repeated in State after State throughout this Nation. So, it should come as no surprise that today, the United States has the highest infant mortality rates of any industrialized Nation in the world.

Five years ago, the study "A Nation At Risk" warned us of "a rising tide of mediocrity" in our Nation's schools.

Immediately, there were political promises of a renewed commitment to education; teachers would be trained; scholarships would be given; equipment would be modernized.

But for the most part, we abandoned that effort before we ever began it.

Sure, some paltry efforts were made. Michigan will spend \$2-million on preschool programs. Is that a commitment to education? At the same time, that State has decided to spend \$1-billion on new prisons.

Where's the investment? Where's the priority?

This year, 1 million babies will be born in the United States who will never finish high school. Most are poor, and as drop-outs, they will stay that way their entire lives.

As young adults, they will be largely illiterate, unskilled, and unemployable. Many will be teen-age parents, raising children in an environment as bad as their own, or worse.

When that class of 1 million drop-outs leaves school this year they take with them \$240-billion in lost earnings and taxes over their lifetimes. And ultimately, they will deliver a bill to society: a bill for welfare, for health care, for law enforcement, and on, and on.

Now, many of you may be sitting there thinking that this is the litany of a liberal. You think my answer to all these crises of the American child is to dig into your wallets and spend your money on a lot of well meaning, but ineffective, programs.

That may be the rhetoric—but it has nothing to do with the reality.

In fact, as I continue to speak out on these issues in the Congress, I continue to win over the most conservative of the conservatives.

And as I speak out throughout the Nation, I win over business leaders.

And if I can win over ORRIN HATCH and HENRY HYDE, I think I can make my case to the Contra Costa Council, too.

Because a growing number of American leaders—in private and in public life—are coming to recognize that just as in business, we must decide that successful competition compels intelligent investment in the next generation of Americans.

That's not liberal, it's not conservative:

It's hard economic and business sense.

The challenges to making America competitive are real, but not insurmountable.

And the real tragedy is not that we do not have the resources or the know-how to succeed.

The real tragedy is that we have refused to act upon our knowledge.

And that short-changes America, not just today, but in our long-term. Because it means we will have a less educated, less healthy, less productive, less trained, and less competitive workforce than other nations.

America cannot be No. 1 economically if we are No. 19 in health, losing millions of work days a year through preventable illness.

America cannot be No. 1 creatively if we are No. 20 in education, with millions of young people unable to follow simple instructions.

America cannot be No. 1 competitively if we oppose child care and parental leave policies that don't force a woman to choose between employment and her children.

We cannot succeed if one-fifth of our children are destined to fail.

We cannot compete if the raw material of the new American economy—the human product, is uncompetitive.

I keep getting told that business people tend to be conservative. So let's take the "conservative" estimate of the Committee for Economic Development—a coalition of some of the Nation's most successful business leaders, the C.E.O.s of major companies like Procter and Gamble, Bell South, and Honeywell.

C.E.D. predicts we are losing over a million children a year to dropouts, to drugs, to crime and to violence.

According to that conservative estimate, by the year 2000, we could have 20 million young Americans—untrained, uneducated, unemployable and unproductive.

If we are to be a competitive Nation; if we are to lead the world economically; if we are to sustain participatory democracy itself, we cannot afford that rate of failure.

We cannot afford schools that produce drop-outs or illiterate graduates.

We can't afford to spend \$200 to teach an American worker basic statistical process control, because first we must teach that worker basic literacy.

In Japan, according to Motorola, it costs 47 cents—because they just hand a book to an employee.

That difference—47 cents versus \$200—is the price of ignoring our schools. And it's a difference that translates into unemployment here at home and jobs exported abroad.

We can't afford to have over 10 percent of all new mothers in California become pregnant as teenagers. Because we know that teen-age parents have half the lifetime earning potential of a woman who defers childbearing until after the age of 20. We know that they require welfare, that they can't get jobs, and that too often, they raise their children in poverty.

We can't afford that waste of human capital.

We remember the "lost generation" of the 1950's and 1960's. Most of them grew up, went to school, got jobs, and made this country the most productive, most competitive, and wealthiest country in the world.

In the 1980's and 1990's, we may really lose a generation of American children, a generation that isn't going to finish school; isn't going to find good jobs; isn't going to be able to afford college or buy houses.

They will be a generation of Americans who are dependent on taxpayers for income, for health care, for housing and for food.

They will offer us nothing, they will produce nothing, because they do not have the basic tools of productivity or of competition.

And those millions, and the millions more in their families, will become an economic anchor chained to the leg of an American economy that will no longer be able to compete.

This fall, we are going to have an opportunity to confront these difficult issues. And for me, it is not just a question of Dukakis or Bush: it's a challenge to America's voters as well as our leaders.

And that's why I am delighted that the unmet needs of America's children and families has taken center stage in the political debate.

Are American voters going to make realistic assessments of what this Nation needs from the next President, and we are going to recognize that the only way we will even come close to solving social, economic, and health issues is for Government to be actively involved as a partner?

We've tried it the other way. We've listened to those who have said that "the best Government is the least Government"; We've heard their argument that when Government gets involved, the problem gets worse.

We have been listening too long to false drummers who summoned us to the false goals of personal enrichment, social indifference and political ambivalence.

Those are not the hallmarks of a great nation.

They do not challenge us to be a compassionate people.

They lull us into a complacency that endangers the integrity, the security, and the potential of this nation and its future.

There are those who argue that the existence of these problems illustrates the failure of past initiatives.

I couldn't disagree more.

Because for the last 5 years, my select committee on children, youth and families has looked at those programs—on nutrition, on early childhood education, on nutrition and preventive services.

And what we've found is that those programs haven't been a waste at all. They're not riddled with fraud; they're not wasting money; they're not increasing poverty.

No, the evidence is overwhelming—from universities, from medical researchers, even from this administration: the programs work, they reduce poverty, they improve health and nutrition, they improve educational performance.

And that isn't the conclusion of a liberal Democrat: it's the conclusion shared by conservative Republicans on my select committee.

So despite all the rhetoric, the fact is that the only failure has been our refusal to make adequate investments in the future of our children.

Now, I know the question in your minds: "Alright, George, but how are you going to do anything about it without spending more money?"

Let me tell you the answer to that question.

You're not going to address the need, you're not going to respond to the crisis, you're not even going to make a dent in the problem without spending more money.

Just as we found out that you can reduce hunger—and we did.

You can reduce elderly poverty—and we did.

You can improve school performance, reduce low birthweight, and infant health—and we did.

But it is going to require an investment by this nation in its future health and economic security.

We cannot run away from the costs of addressing these problems any more than we can evade the problems themselves.

That's why the committee on economic development—those leaders of American business—called for an expanded commitment of resources, not because they want to spend money wildly, but because they recognize the enormous cost to this country if we fail to attack the serious education, health, and social crises that are undermining our society.

You can't do it on the cheap and be effective. As C.E.D. concluded, "Any plan for major improvements in the development and education of disadvantaged children that does not recognize the need for additional resources is doomed to failure."

"The price of action may seem high, but the costs of inaction are far higher."

And whether we are liberals or conservatives, whether we are Keynesians or supply-siders, whether we are Democrats or Republicans, on this we can all agree:

America cannot begin the 21st century "doomed to failure."

We don't lack the evidence. We don't even lack the resources.

All we lack is the will to invest in the future of America.

Isn't it time we committed ourselves to a national agenda that shows at least as much

concern for the human cost of failure as for the fiscal cost of success?

But the fact is that investing isn't just good social policy. It's good human policy, too.

A few hundred dollars per pregnancy dramatically cuts low birthweight, and the thousands of dollars a day infant intensive care costs.

But half the eligible kids can't get on W.I.C.

Head Start dramatically improves test scores, reduces drop outs, and cuts repeat grades. It saves us five bucks for every dollar we spend.

But 80 percent of the kids are locked out of Head Start.

When Richard Riley became Governor of South Carolina, that State ranked 49th in education spending, it had one of the highest dropout rates, and its student scored abysmally low.

Five years later, because Governor Riley had the foresight to demand better schools and the courage to ask voters to pay for them, 61 new education programs were created with the support of teachers, business leaders and parents. Tough accountability standards have been created for administrators and teachers. Parents are sending their children back to public schools, and morale has never been higher.

Who says America can't compete?

No greater challenge faces the next President, the next Congress, and all Americans:

Not to create an expensive Government;

Not to create an intrusive Government;

But to find an effective, compassionate and intelligent Government that educates its children, cares for its ill, houses its homeless and feeds its hungry.

As America closes out this decade, and as we move from one millennium to another, from one generation to another, and from one administration to another, let us take stock of our resources.

Americans must quickly decide how we will compete, for surely we must compete, if we are to pass along to our grandchildren a Nation which holds the promise of the America our parents passed on to us.

I believe that it is apparent that many of the strengths of the past will play a less significant role in the coming years: natural resources, military power, overseas colonies.

None of these assures a Nation's success any longer.

In fact, reliance on many of these traditional forms of national power will undermine our fiscal ability to prepare for the challenges of a world of unparalleled competitiveness.

Success will not come from domination of Third World countries, or from having bloated military budgets, or from conquest.

The Soviet Union realizes it; Japan realizes it; Germany realizes it.

Our resources, our economy, and our policies—domestic and international—must now turn from the aftermath of past wars to the challenges of future economic competition.

That is a competition which will not be won with weaponry or on battlefields. It will be won through creativity, through ingenuity, through aggressiveness and through determination.

It is a challenge unlike any which has ever faced this Nation, and it is one we cannot afford to lose.

These are choices America must make, and 1988 is, I believe, the critical year.

If we can put aside the past ideological divisions, the partisanship and the simplification, I believe this Nation has the resources

and the ability to meet every one of these challenges, and to succeed.

I believe we have the best minds, the greatest abilities, and the national history to again achieve first rate status in every field of economic endeavor.

I don't believe there is another nation in the world that can be more productive, more competitive, or more resourceful than the United States.

What we need is the commitment, the determination, the discipline and the leadership—both from public and private sectors, working together, channeling the resources of this great country.

We don't have a single American child to waste in our effort to assure the economic leadership of this Nation in the coming century.

I believe we can meet that challenge, and so do you. And I want to work together with you towards reaching those goals.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to meet with you today.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE DEPORTATION OF JOSEPH DOHERTY

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate my opposition to Attorney General Meese's decision in June to deport Joseph Doherty. Mr. Meese's decision contradicted a Federal judge's 1985 ruling. This ruling held that Mr. Doherty, accused of killing a British soldier, could not be extradited because the killing was a political act.

Since 1983, Mr. Doherty has been held in a New York jail, pending judicial determination of whether Britain's request for extradition should be granted. Under the applicable extradition treaty between the United States and Britain, political acts cannot serve as the basis for extradition. By making his decision, Attorney General Meese allowed political considerations to interfere with the normal judicial process. The decision as to whether the United States should send Mr. Doherty to Britain should be made by the courts under the proper extradition treaty. Mr. Meese turned this situation into a deportation case by claiming that Mr. Doherty should be sent to Britain for illegally entering the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to anyone who has carefully scrutinized this case that Mr. Meese distorted the judicial process to reflect the administration's ideological proclivities. Fortunately, this decision will be reviewed by the Second Court of Appeals in the near future. I only hope that Mr. Meese's resignation will put an end to the Department of Justice's interference in our judicial system.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint com-

mittees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, August 11, 1988, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

AUGUST 12

9:30 a.m.

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 2672, to provide Federal recognition for the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina.

SR-485

SEPTEMBER 7

2:00 p.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2571, to designate certain National Forest System lands in the State of Oklahoma for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, and create the Winding Stair Mountain National Recreation and Wilderness Area.

SR-332

SEPTEMBER 8

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Environmental Protection Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up S. 2272, to authorize funds for fiscal years 1989 and 1990 for programs of the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act of 1980, S. 2384, to authorize funds for fiscal years 1989, 1990, and 1991 for programs of the Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act, and other pending calendar business.

SD-406

SEPTEMBER 9

8:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold oversight hearings to review the adequacy of available funds and personnel for the VA health-care system.

SH-216

SEPTEMBER 15

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2657, Campaign Cost Reduction Act.

SD-562

SEPTEMBER 20

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Foreign Commerce and Tourism Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings to review the U.S. and foreign commercial service.

SR-253

Rules and Administration

Business meeting, to consider a report on the operation of the Senate, and a report on impeachment proceedings pursuant to instructions of the Senate.

SR-301

SEPTEMBER 27

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review legislative priorities of the American Legion.

SD-106